

REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed June 24, 2005. Claims 1, 3-12, 20, 22-29, 34, and 36-47 were rejected and remain pending in the application.

Priority Claim Information

The Examiner noted that the priority claim information added to the present application in a preliminary amendment is defective because there is no commonly named inventor of the present application and the applications to which priority was claimed. Applicant has amended the specification to remove the priority claim information. Thus, the present application does not claim priority benefit to any other application.

Section 102 Rejection

Claims 1-9, 20-26, 34, and 46-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Thomsen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,246, hereinafter "Thomsen"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the claim as amended recites in pertinent part:

receiving user input specifying configuration information for the node;
automatically displaying one or more input terminals of the plurality of possible input terminals and/or one or more output terminals of the plurality of possible output terminals for the node, based on the configuration information, wherein said displaying the one or more input terminals for the node comprises displaying only a first subset of the plurality of possible input terminals, wherein a second subset of the plurality of possible input terminals are not displayed, and wherein said displaying the one or more output terminals for the node comprises displaying only a first subset of the plurality of possible output terminals, wherein a second subset of the plurality of possible output terminals are not displayed;

Thus, the method of claim 1 comprises automatically displaying only a first subset of the possible input terminals associated with the node, where a second subset of the possible input terminals are not displayed, and/or displaying only a first subset of the possible output terminals associated with the node, where a second subset of the possible output terminals are not displayed. The first subset of the possible input terminals and/or

the first subset of the possible output terminals are displayed based on the configuration information specified by the user input.

As Applicant discussed in the response to the previous Office Action, Thomsen relates generally to a graphical programming system and method which includes three-dimensional nodes that are wired or connected to form a graphical program or block diagram. However, the nodes of Thomsen's graphical programming system have pre-defined terminals. Thomsen's disclosure contains no teaching at all regarding displaying only a subset, but not all, of a set of possible input terminals for a node or displaying only a subset, but not all, of a set of possible output terminals for a node, based on configuration information specified by user input. Thomsen describes no means to suppress or omit the display of certain input or output terminals for a node, and such functionality is not described as, or considered part of, Thomsen's disclosed invention.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner writes, "Applicant argues that '[In Thomsen,] no means were described to suppress or omit the display of the unused terminals, and such functionality (not displaying terminals that are not used) is not described as, or considered part of, Thomsen's disclosed invention.' However, the claim does not recite this feature. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive since it is based on non-claimed feature."

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims do recite the feature of omitting the display of one or more input terminals or output terminals associated with a node. For example, as noted above, claim 1 recites, "wherein said displaying the one or more input terminals for the node comprises displaying only a first subset of the plurality of possible input terminals, wherein a second subset of the plurality of possible input terminals are not displayed". Similarly, claim 1 recites, "wherein said displaying the one or more output terminals for the node comprises displaying only a first subset of the plurality of possible output terminals, wherein a second subset of the plurality of possible output terminals are not displayed".

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 recites features that are not taught or suggested by Thomsen. Thus, claim 1, and claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct over Thomsen, and are thus allowable, for at least the reasons discussed above. Inasmuch as the other independent claims recite limitations

similar to those of claim 1, Applicant submits that the other independent claims, and claims dependent thereon, are also allowable

Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. For example, claim 5 recites as follows:

5. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 4,
wherein the configuration information specifies desired functionality for the node;
wherein said automatically determining the one or more input terminals and/or the one or more output terminals for the node based on the configuration information comprises automatically determining the one or more input terminals and/or the one or more output terminals for the node based on the specified desired functionality for the node.

The configuration information which specifies the desired functionality for the node is specified by user input, as recited in claim 1. Thus, one or more input terminals are automatically selected and displayed based on user-supplied configuration information specifying desired functionality for the node, and/or one or more output terminals are automatically selected and displayed based on user-supplied configuration information specifying desired functionality for the node. These features are simply not taught by Thomsen. Thomsen's nodes have pre-defined functionality, and Thomsen does not teach the concept of receiving user input specifying functionality performed by a node. In the section cited by the Examiner (Col. 6, lines 31-38), Thomsen teaches that, "As shown, the graphical program includes a plurality of three-dimensional node icons which perform desired functions." However, Applicant submits that in this context, performing "desired functions" simply means that the user has included the desired three-dimensional node icons in the graphical program in order to accomplish the desired functions. Thomsen does not teach the concept of receiving user input to specify or alter the function performed by a three-dimensional node icon, i.e., does not teach receiving user input specifying configuration information for a node, where the configuration information specifies desired functionality for the node, as recited in claim 5.

As per claim 9, the claim recites as follows:

9. (Currently Amended) The method of claim 1, further comprising:
automatically generating graphical source code for the node to implement functionality specified by the configuration information, wherein said automatically generating the graphical source code comprises automatically

generating a plurality of interconnected nodes operable to implement the functionality specified by the configuration information.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited portion of Thomsen (Col. 8, lines 50-59) teaches nothing at all about automatically generating a plurality of interconnected nodes operable to implement functionality specified by the configuration information, where the configuration information is specified by user input.

Applicant also submits that numerous ones of the other dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further detailed discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Section 103 Rejection

Claims 10-12, 14-19, 27-33, 35, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thomsen and Jordan et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,155,836, hereinafter "Jordan"). Applicant notes that claims 14-19, 30-33, and 35 were cancelled in the response to the previous Office Action, and so their rejections are rendered moot.

Regarding claims 10-12, 27-29, and 43-45, Applicant notes that if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) Applicant respectfully submits that since these claims depend from amended claims 1, 20, and 34, respectively, which have been shown above to be patentably distinct and non-obvious, claims 10-12, 27-29, and 43-45 are similarly patentably distinct and non-obvious over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-48500/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 9/24/2005 JCH/JLB